

**STATE COMMITTEE OF INTERPRETERS
DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION
3605 MISSOURI BOULEVARD
Jefferson City, Missouri**

September 20, 2002 – Open Minutes

The open session of the State Committee of Interpreters was called to order by Loretto Durham, Chairperson, at 10:18am at the Division of Professional Registration, 3605 Missouri Blvd, Jefferson City, Missouri.

Members Present:

Loretto Durham, Chair
Carrie McCray, Secretary
John Adams
Sandy Drummond
Kim McEnulty
Lisa Guillory, Public Member

Staff Present:

Pam Groose, Executive Director
Roxy Brockman, Clerk IV
Karen Hess, Assistant Attorney General
Shannon Hamilton, Attorney General's office
Peggy Withrow, Contract Interpreter
Kelley Clark, Contract Interpreter

Visitors:

Kathleen Alexander, CIS
Judy Benfield, Deaf Community
Roy Miller, MCDHH
Amy Fowler, MCDHH
Kim Davis, MCDHH

A motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. Drummond to go into closed for #1, #2, #3, and #9 at 10:19am. Ms. Drummond, Dr. Guillory, Mr. Adams and Ms Cray all approved.

The committee returned to open session at 11:30 am and a motion was made by Ms. McCray and seconded by Ms. Drummond to adjourn for lunch. Open session resumed at 1:10pm.

Review and Approval of Agenda:

A motion was made by Dr. Guillory and seconded by Mr. Adams to approve the open agenda as submitted. All approved.

Review and Approval of Open Minutes:

A motion was made by Ms. Drummond and seconded by Mr. Adams to approve the open minutes from the July 19, 2002 meeting as amended. All approved.

Reports from MCDHH and BCI Representative/s:

Dr. Miller reported that the BCI had not met since the State Committee of Interpreter's last meeting. He said the next BCI meeting will be on Friday, October 18, 2002 from 1:00pm – 5:00pm at Tan-Tar-A, Lake of the Ozarks, Missouri.

He said the MCDHH did meet on September 11, 2002 and at that meeting the Commission approved the starting contracts that will be offered to the evaluators, making the evaluators paid evaluators instead of volunteers. He said he thought the next meeting for the MCDHH will be on November 5, 2002.

Meetings:

- *Attended* -- Nothing to report.
- *Upcoming* -- MCDHH Convention, October 18-20, 2002, Tan-Tar-A, Lake of the Ozarks, Missouri. Ms. Drummond is interpreting and Mr. Adams will be presenting, so their expenses will be taken care of by MCDHH. Ms. McCray indicated that William Woods would pay for her attendance at the conference. Ms. Durham said that her company would pay for the registration but the SCI will need to pay for hotel. Ms. McEnulty indicated she would like to attend also and SCI needs to pay for all of her expenses. Ms. Guillory said that she would not be able to attend due to a prior commitment.

In regard to the exhibit table, the following schedule was tentatively agreed upon by the committee members:

Friday, October, 18, 2002

Ms. Drummond, 5:00pm – 7:00pm

No coverage from 7:00pm – 9:00pm during keynote presentation

Ms. Drummond and Ms. McCray, 9:00pm – 11:00pm

Saturday, October 19, 2002

Mr. Adams, 9:00am – 11:00am

Ms. McEnulty, 1:00pm – 3:30pm

Ms. McCray, 3:30pm – 5:30pm

Ms. Durham and Ms. Drummond, 5:30pm – 7:00pm

The committee members requested that staff prepare the following items to be taken to the convention: 25 Application packets, Newsletters, Easels, SCI poster and flow chart poster showing the governmental structure of both the SCI and BCI. The committee members will wear their Professional Registration name tags.

Report from Executive Director:

Ms. Goose indicated the financial report was enclosed for their review. She said that staff participated in the entry interview on September 19, 2002 for renewals and that renewals will be mailed out November 1, 2002 to 490 licensees.

Ms. Goose said at the last meeting committee members agreed upon a November 20, 2002 meeting date but a conference room is not available for that day within Professional Registration. She said the main conference room is available on December 4, 2002 and the committee members agreed to change the date.

Ms. Drummond asked if there was anything new about a deaf public member and Ms. Goose responded that she knew a name had been submitted to the governor's office but nothing had gone forth with it. Ms. Goose said that she knew packets were being mailed out but that the Division has not been hearing back from these individuals. The committee discussed the process for applying for board member positions. Dr. Miller indicated that he has submitted names of deaf people in the past and has recently submitted another name to the Governor's office. Ms. Drummond suggested discussing a potential newsletter article at the next meeting that would be a communication to the public.

In response to Ms. Drummond's question, Ms. Goose verified the proposed statute language in regard to the exemption for visiting interpreters and the authority to deny renewals has been submitted to the Division and she should be able to provide an update at the next meeting. Additionally, Ms. Goose also verified the proposed rule change in regard to interpreter's not practicing beyond their certification level has also been submitted to the Division.

Statutes:

209.321.6 Exemption language / temporary practice of interpreting -- Mr. Goose previously reported this proposed language had been given to the Division.

209.321.7 Exemption language / student interpreter language. The committee members discussed the proposed student interpreter language. Mr. Adams provided a written report in regard to a survey he compiled of 100 of his clients which is included as Attachment A. Ms. Drummond provided a verbal report of deaf community members she had e-mailed or spoke to in regard to their opinion or reaction to student interpreters and what the committee has voted upon so far and what the committee needs to decide upon next. She said two responded and said level two (2) need to be supervised and another person indicated that level one needed to be supervised also.

Ms. Drummond said her only concern with the draft language was the last time the committee discussed this they had agreed level one (1) would not need supervision, level three (3), four (4), or five (5) would have to have supervision and they could only do that if they had the IPC, were in an ITP, etc. She said that the committee made a point to table level two (2) but the draft language indicates an exemption for level (2). Ms. Hess apologized and said that must have misread her notes.

Ms. McEnulty said she was confused and needed clarification in regard to the statement that a level one can go out and interpret unsupervised, that she understood they couldn't and that they had to be supervised somehow someday. Ms. Durham responded and said that it means not having to be watched while they are in the act of doing that interpreting that is not being called interpreting so that they don't have to have a license. She said if they are doing a level one job, the teacher or a certified

interpreter does not have to watch them do that work but they do have to be supervised and be in an interpreter-training program. She said the instructor has to approve those assignments that they are going on but while they are actually doing the interpreting no one has to be there watching them and be ready to bail them out. Ms. McCray further clarified and responded that it is not the student that has a level one certification, but it is a level one assignment.

Judy Benfield indicated to the committee that she is deaf and works with a lot of deaf people. She said she thought interpreter students need to be with a licensed interpreter when they go to different settings, even if it is a boy scout meeting or a girl scout meeting or a tupperware party. She said if they do not have a licensed certified interpreter with them and they are making any type of mistakes does that mean that the deaf person is responsible for what is going on there. She said if there is a mistake going on and the communication is not getting across it would be better to have a certified interpreter with them. She said it doesn't matter if it is an apprentice or novice level assignment since she believes they all should have a certified and licensed interpreter with them at all times. She said in her experience with working with deaf or hard of hearing consumers that they do not always understand what is going on and are not willing to admit that they do not understand. She said that if the student has a certified interpreter with them in a mentoring capacity they could get feedback immediately

Ms. Durham said she has thought about it this and that she knows in the past that Florissant Valley tends to send 2 students out together and if you are both students how do you know when the other is missing. She said if they are both lost, how are they giving each other feedback. She said she knew that they are putting them in situations where they are safe. She said even if it is a Girl Scout meeting, like Ms. Benfield said, and in the meeting it is indicated they are going to go and camp, but need to raise money and get the parents' approval. She said if information is miscommunicated and misunderstood the parent could be committing to something, which could end up being a serious financial drain. She said she knew where Flo Valley was coming from and the number of students that if they built a better relationship with the agencies that maybe more of those things could be taken care of and they could have one on one supervision. She said she knew the faculty couldn't, as there are not enough of them. Mr. Adams said that he was a recent graduate from Flo Valley and that it would have been wonderful to have a certified licensed experienced interpreter present during some of the assignments, but knowing assignments were set up the way they were was because the agencies did not have the financial means to pay for licensed professional interpreters and the professional interpreters didn't have the means to volunteer that much time and not get paid. Mr. Adams indicated that his agency has tried to supervise students but because of confidentiality and numerous medical assignments, the students could not go and the students and interpreters became frustrated with the process. He said occasionally they are able to pair up one or two students with an interpreter for a couple of weeks and it will work. Ms. Durham said her agency does a lot of activities that are in schools and there is not a reason that the students could not be paired up with their interpreters.

Ms. Drummond said she thought one of the things the Committee needed to discuss is whether or not supervision is necessary to protect our consumers. She said if it is felt that it is necessary to protect our consumers then logistics need to be discussed. She said that if it is felt that supervision is not necessary then no further discussion is needed. She said that if it is decided that supervision is necessary then there are some models that can be used for internship that can be shared with other programs. She said some programs will count 160 hours but not all of it will be pure interpreting time, they also count the translation time and time spent with their mentor.

Ms. Durham said she felt the committee needed to decide if in all situations the student needed to be supervised/watched during the entire time. She said maybe if this could be determined then the language could be put together. Ms. McEnulty said she wanted to know if the members were saying it's okay for students to go out in a level one arena totally unsupervised. Ms. Durham said she had the same question and said it sounded to her like the committee members were okay with that. Ms. McEnulty said she would be comfortable with students going out in a level one arena because she reads #2 to say that it is appropriate for a practicum student to work in a level one or two arena unsupervised but under the guidance of the school. Mr. Adams said he did not agree with the level two (apprentice) in #2. He said based upon what the novice level are allowed to do and that he would have to trust the interpreter training programs in Missouri to know the type of novice situation that they are sending the practicum students to and to ensure that the students are ready for that novice situation without an onsite supervisor.

A motion was made by Ms. McCray and seconded by Dr. Guillory to include the Novice and Apprentice levels and remove the Comprehensive level in subsection two of the proposed language. Dr. Guillory, Ms. Drummond, Ms. McEnulty and Ms. McCray voted yes. Mr. Adams voted no.

Ms. Hess recommended leaving the phrase "A person is not considered to be interpreting pursuant to the provisions of this section if:" and removing the words "a person meets one of the following requirements" from the first paragraph. She also recommended that the word "or" be removed from subsection one.

Ms. Durham said that she thought as Mr. Adams suggested earlier that they should be very explicit that student interpreters are not allowed, not exempt in comprehensive situations.

Ms. Hess further suggested the verbiage "Persons holding an intern practicum certification shall not practice interpreting in a setting requiring a comprehensive certification pursuant to" and name the rule, which could be added to the proposed language as the last paragraph.

Ms. Durham requested a motion for accepting the proposed language and recapped what had been discussed throughout this portion of the meeting. To remove the phrase at the end of the first sentence "a person meets one of the following requirements", removing the word "or" at the end of the first subsection and adding a period after "higher learning", removing subsection two entirely, and adding the words "Novice and

Apprentice” after the phrase “For those settings that requires an”. Dr. Guillory clarified that the phrase “Persons holding an intern practicum certification shall not practice interpreting in a setting requiring a comprehensive certification pursuant to” and list the would be added as the last paragraph. A motion was made by Ms. McCray and seconded by Dr. Guillory. Ms. McCray, Ms. Drummond, and Dr. Guillory voted yes. Mr. Adams voted no. Ms. McEnulty abstained.

Ms. Drummond said that there are also implications that have to be considered by the committee members after this is over. She said this was not the plan the committee decided upon at the last meeting. She said the visitors that were here at the meeting are going to be very upset that the committee has now changed the plans for level one.

Dr. Guillory said that she wanted to bring up that there is no way to get every one to agree. She said she felt this was a compromise to licensing students and that in the end the supervision will be good, that people will step up to the plate and they will make an effort to help with supervision.

Mr. Adams requested that an item be placed on the next meeting agenda for whoever attends the next MCDHH meeting to bring up getting CEUs for the working licensed interpreters who are doing the supervision.

Ms. Goose confirmed that the proposed language will be submitted to the Division on Monday morning to be included

A motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. McCray to adjourn at 3:50pm.

Executive Director signature

Date approved by committee